

To: Schmittiel, Paula[Schmittiel.Paula@epa.gov]
Cc: Faulk, Libby[Faulk.Libby@epa.gov]
From: Peterson, Cynthia
Sent: Mon 4/28/2014 5:35:39 PM
Subject: FW: Upper Animas Projects list - Clean Water Act 319
upperanimas_projects2014update.xlsx
Bullion King Implementation Project PIP 031414MHcoms.docx

Hi, Paula.

Attached is a spreadsheet from Marcella with information about all the 319 grants that have been approved for the Upper Animas Watershed. It looks as though the total federal grant funds allocated have been \$2,670,519, with total expenditures (including grant matching funds) of \$4,993,387. Also attached is the project implementation plan for a new grant, the Bullion King Implementation Project.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like more information.

Cynthia

Cynthia Peterson

Community Involvement Coordinator

Public Affairs and Community Involvement

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII

1595 Wynkoop

Denver, CO 80202-1129

303-312-6879 -- direct dial

From: Hutchinson, Marcella
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 10:29 AM
To: Peterson, Cynthia
Subject: Upper Animas Projects list - Clean Water Act 319

Cynthia-

The Upper Animas has long been a focus area for Colorado, and was one of the very early places where the watershed approach to address mine waste has been applied. The Upper Animas could be viewed as one end of the spectrum of watershed groups working on mining issues with a fiercely independent focus on purely voluntary action. I have attached the mark-up of the Bullion King for its “all projects by anyone and everyone” appendix (H p. 35). The group has been quite successful bringing mining companies to the table. It’s not just been EPA and BLM funding.

In case you don’t already have it, here’s their website:
<http://www.animasriverstakeholdersgroup.org/>

While I think both the watershed group and the community remain pro-mining and proud of their mining history, like Creede ~ 5 years ago, I think Silverton, and San Juan County as a whole are moving toward an understanding that they are unlikely to address the biggest problems without a Superfund Designation. Gwen Christiansen was active in that process in Creede and may be a good resource.

Sabrina Forrest has also been the project officer/contracting officer’s representative for Brownfields Projects in the Upper Animas. Because “mine-scarred lands” are eligible as brownfields, that program is a common and welcome partner in several of the watersheds where mining is an issue. They’re more likely to be “the face of EPA” than anyone in EP, alas.

There’s a flip side to watershed groups. The Clear Creek Watershed Foundation also focuses on the purely collaborative – but with CERCLA as an active partner. They focus on those mine sites that will not be addressed under Superfund but that still cause water quality problems. They view EPA’s Superfund role as important to addressing water quality, land contamination, and human health concerns in the valley.

Project implementation plans for projects dating from 2005 forward are usually available in the public version GRTS. Sometimes final reports will come up, as well. If you can't get to something you want, I can probably get the 2000 and newer information from somewhere in my own files if not from GRTS proper.

GRTS guest portal home: <http://iaspub.epa.gov/apex/grts/f?p=110:9087:0::NO:::>

Welcome to wonderful world of historic mine restoration! It's really very cool.

Marcella